

The Sun

THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 1904.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second-Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.
 DAILY, Per Month, \$1.00
 DAILY, Per Year, \$10.00
 SUNDAY, Per Year, \$3.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$12.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$1.00
 Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at No. 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will send them to the address given below, we will be glad to accept them, and if possible, to return them to the sender.

Readers of THE SUN leaving the city can have the Daily and Sunday editions mailed to their address (which may be changed when necessary) for 10 cents a month. Order through your newsdealer or THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

Mr. Root on Mr. Davis's Age.

The surpassing political ability of ELIHU ROOT appears in his brief speech of notification addressed yesterday to Senator FAIRBANKS; likewise Mr. Root's knack of saying politically offensive things in a personally humane and irreproachable way.

Most men in Mr. Root's case would have attempted at Indianapolis to repeat and reinforce the great service he rendered his party at Chicago. Most men would have improved the occasion by enlarging and emphasizing the previously advanced idea that the continuous record of the Republican party, rather than the incidental personality of President ROOSEVELT, is the issue to be dwelt upon by Republican orators in this campaign.

Mr. Root made no attempt of that kind. He adopted another line of suggestion in his remarks to Mr. FAIRBANKS; and, with consummate rhetorical skill, he contrived to put in absolute sharpness of outline before the mind of every voter an issue which thus far has been generally overlooked, or vaguely discussed, or politely ignored.

That is the issue of age between the Vice-Presidential candidates. Mr. ROOT wasted no time on other questions. He informed Mr. FAIRBANKS that the primary duty of the Vice-President is to take up the burden of the Presidency if occasion requires. He pointed out the fact that five of the last twelve Presidents have died in office and have been succeeded by Vice-Presidents, and then he went on to arraign the Democracy for nominating for Vice-President "an excellent gentleman, born during the Presidency of JAMES MONROE, who before the 4th of March next will be in the eighty-second year of his age, and before the next Administration is ended will be approaching his eighty-sixth birthday."

Mr. ROOT continued:

"In contemplating the remote possibility of the election of the Democratic candidate for Vice-President, the people of the country are bound to contemplate also as a necessary result of such an election in case of the President's death that others, not chosen by the people, and we do not know who, would govern in the name of a nominal successor unable himself to perform the Constitutional duties of his office, or, worse still, that serious doubt whether the Vice-President had not reached a condition of 'inability' within the meaning of the Constitution would throw the title of the office into dispute."

"The serious effect of such an event upon the Government and upon the business interests and general welfare of the country, and the serious effect even of the continual menace of such an event, must be apparent to every thoughtful mind."

In confining his Indianapolis speech to the question of Mr. HENRY G. DAVIS's great age and the possible consequences of his election along with Judge PARKER, Mr. ROOT violated no rule of propriety. It is a legitimate matter for the voters to consider. It was a proper subject for discussion by him in Mr. FAIRBANKS's presence. Nobody had yet ventured to present the unpleasant question so clearly, but it is now before the meeting and it is sure to play a considerable part in the campaign.

The Saloon Dedicated by a Bishop.

Bishop POTTER has given the sanction of the Church and of his ecclesiastical office to a liquor saloon; why? For the reason that this rum shop is established on the policy of eschewing mere money making. It will return to its stockholders only 5 per cent. on their investment, however much it makes, and any surplus of profit is to be used in setting up other drinking places on the same principle. Now a 5 per cent. investment is first rate, if it is secure. If this saloon shall continuously earn a handsome surplus above that dividend or interest, its stock or bonds will be worth more than par.

Is a liquor saloon reprehensible or desirable as a social institution according to the amount of its profits to the keepers? That is, is the business of liquor saloon reputable and commendable when it returns on the investment only 5 per cent., and disreputable and reprehensible when the profit is greater, or when it is run for the purpose of making more money, if possible?

It might be replied that if this saloon is prosperous and earns more than 5 per cent. other saloons of the same kind will be set up with the surplus and if they, too, are profitable, the "not for the purpose of making money" saloons can be increased indefinitely, with the consequence that all others will be unable to stand the competition and only 5 per cent. saloons established on a religious basis will be left.

The philanthropic saloon proposes to attract trade by offering superior inducements to those of the ordinary liquor trade, in the way of cleanliness and what not; and, incidentally, to promote temperance and encourage sobriety by selling "soft drinks," tea, coffee and chocolate.

Already liquor saloons generally dispense "soft drinks," and usually they are made specially attractive in decoration and appointments by men whose long experience of the public tastes has taught them how to proceed. They will ask no odds in that matter from Bishop POTTER's saloon. If his bar introduces any profitable innovations they will

quickly adopt them, and improve on them.

In other words, the regular saloon business is run by shrewd and astute men, who are not likely to be beaten in the competition by religious amateurs.

Bishop POTTER said in his dedicatory address that as he belonged to several clubs at which liquor is sold, where he could go to "spend a social evening," he wanted to make "the saloon better and more attractive to the poor man who cannot go to a club." But we never heard complaints from poor men that the saloons already existing are not good enough and attractive enough for them. Usually they are the most attractive places in their neighborhoods; and the beverages sold at them, as frequent analysis has shown, are as good as those at the Bishop's clubs, so far as concerns their effects.

The Bishop wants to do the poor man good; but, naturally enough, he is ignorant of the liquor saloon business. Actually, its least need is of such attractiveness to custom as he imagines is required. The saloon is too attractive already, in the view of its enemies, for the seductions it offers are increased the more inviting it is made.

Bishop POTTER and his fellow philanthropists can start out with one well-established fact as a basis. It is that people go to a liquor saloon to get a drink and not simply to spend a social evening. If the drink suits their taste and the price is satisfactory, the saloon serves for them the main purpose of its being. Another fact is that the capital invested in the business, many millions of dollars, already offers as great inducements in the way of what is called "the poor man's club" as the patrons of saloons want and would use.

The experiment of the new saloon is not promising. It is made to create an artificial demand rather than to supply a real demand, and when its novelty has worn off, its custom is likely to fall away.

The Tenement House Department.

The first report of the Tenement House Department has just been published in two substantial volumes. It covers the period from Jan. 1, 1902, to July 1, 1903, comprising all but the last six months of Commissioner ROBERT W. DE FOREST's administration. The legislation proposed by the New York State Tenement House Commission of 1900 aimed at a more radical treatment of the tenement house problem than had ever before been attempted. The present report has been compiled primarily with a view to showing how this legislation has worked in practice.

The proposals submitted by the commission provided for a new Tenement House act and for the creation of a Tenement House Department as a separate branch of the city government. Both measures were adopted by the Legislature, the former going into effect on April 12, 1901, and the latter on Jan. 1, 1902.

The Tenement House act was by no means a mere extension of principles embodied in existing legislation. Its spirit and purpose were new. It was the first law having for its object the improvement of the moral, as well as physical, environment of the tenement population. It provided for the suppression of prostitution in tenements, raised the standard of future building construction, and called for the alteration of unsanitary houses erected under preceding, less exacting rules.

The enforcement of a law of such sweeping character demanded a special administrative machinery. The functions entrusted to the new department were extremely varied and extensive. They included supervision of all tenement building operations, compelling structural alterations in 40,000 unsanitary old houses, stamping out a widespread social evil, and making sanitary inspections in all tenement houses, which on Jan. 1, 1902, numbered upward of 82,000. Every tenement house in the city was to be inspected at least once a year, while those in which rents of apartments averaged less than \$25 a month were to be investigated monthly.

The department was clothed with ample, almost arbitrary, powers. It can peremptorily stop work on new buildings and vacate old buildings. No new tenement can be occupied without its permit. All owners or responsible agents of tenements are obliged to report their names and addresses, together with other information, to its registrar of records. It has the right of entry into the private apartments of two-thirds of the population of the city. With a force of 400 employees and a budget of \$500,000, it has the means at command to carry on the work for which it was created.

The Tenement House Department, it will be seen, is in constant contact with property interests of enormous value and with a vast number of people—tenants, owners, agents and housekeepers. Its relation with the public apparently presented opportunities for blackmail on a large scale. Besides, experience in other branches of the city government gave no assurance that, even if corruption could be avoided, the department would be competent to enforce effectively and impartially a law so complex as the Tenement House act.

Indeed, most of the flagrant evils which the act sought to remove had grown up through past corruption and inefficiency in the Building, Health and Police departments. When, for example, the State Tenement House Commission of 1900 made an inspection of 608 tenement houses in process of construction under the jurisdiction of the old Building Department, violations of law were found in all but fifteen of the buildings.

Many advocates of tenement improvement feared that the legislation procured by the commission attempted to accomplish too much. To secure an honest administration of the Tenement House act was not sufficient. Tact and ability of a high order were also necessary. The act had been carried through the Legislature on a wave of reform sentiment. It had been hotly opposed by the building industry and was disliked by property owners. In order to remain

permanently on the statute books it would have to be administered in such a way as to demonstrate its value and thereby attract popular support.

For this reason one of the most interesting parts of Mr. DE FOREST's report is in the chapters describing the organization of the Tenement House Department and its methods of work. The description covers more than a hundred pages, and is sufficiently complete to serve as a manual of reference. It reveals throughout the same practical judgment and freedom from political influence which prompted Mr. DE FOREST on his appointment as Tenement House Commissioner to secure the services of such eminently competent associates as LAWRENCE VELLER, the leading expert on housing reform in the United States; WEBSTER C. BUSH, former Commissioner of Buildings in Brooklyn; CHARLES E. BALL, former chief inspector of plumbing in the District of Columbia; Prof. WILLIAM R. PATTERSON, former statistician of the State Board of Control of Iowa; and Miss KATE H. CLAGHORN, of the Federal Census.

That the work of the department has been honest, impartial, tactful, and of conspicuous value to the public is sufficiently shown by the popularity which the department has achieved. Attempts to emasculate the Tenement House act in the Legislature have aroused spontaneous protests from the great tenement population of the East Side, and no amendment of any kind has been made unless asked for by the Commissioner.

In the organization of the department, care was taken to separate the executive work from the field work and to see that every employee should be subject to supervision. Inspectors became mere gatherers of information, without authority to issue orders. Printed schedules were devised covering every possible infraction of the law. They are in the form of questions which for the most part require merely "yes" or "no" for an answer. The questions are grouped according to subjects, as plumbing, fire-escapes, structural improvements, &c., each group being contained on a separate card.

When filled in by the district inspectors, the cards are returned to the executive office, which takes whatever action is indicated. The cards are of uniform size and are filed in a card catalogue arranged by street number. Every new inspection brings the old cards out for comparison, and any misstatement they contain is certain to be detected sooner or later by the officials in charge of the catalogue. In addition, the field work of the district inspectors is under constant review by supervising inspectors, who report systematically to the office.

The system of administration in use has made blackmail impossible as a continued and extensive practice, while at the same time economizing labor. In the course of eighteen months the closest surveillance resulted in the detection and discharge of only four employees. The Tenement House Department, therefore, has not only firmly established the cause of housing reform in New York, but, according to Mr. DE FOREST, has "demonstrated clearly that corruption need not exist in any of the large city departments."

Has He Succeeded?

This letter asks a question which is probably in the minds of most people, for only a very few of any generation, comparatively and even actually, can have fulfilled their hopes in their careers, or, in other words, risen into special distinction by reason of their success in winning the prizes of life they deem the greatest:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I desire an unbiased, unprejudiced opinion of what I amount to in the world. Just how much I may pass for, considering what I have in the way of education."

"Thirty-five years ago I was born on the East Side of New York city, close to where Tweed held forth. My parents were then in comfortable circumstances, but reverses came, and at 10 years of age I found myself practically cut off from any hope of ever again going to school. Soon I was at work in a grocery for the large salary of one dollar and a half a week. From that time on until today I have been at it, working hard. Sometimes I think I have done fairly well; again, I feel I am a total failure."

"When about 15 years of age I began to read THE SUN and have never wavered in the feeling that it was the one true newspaper. To this paper, in my opinion, I owe to-day what I am."

"To get back to the story. I grew and waxed in strength and health. During the interval from my advent in the grocery store I have done as follows: I bought and studied a grammar, SHAKESPEARE, sometimes read the Bible, the History of England, Greece, Rome, France, our own country; I have read MILTON's 'Paradise Lost,' DICKENS, POPE, HAWTHORNE, LONGFELLOW, the Quixote of Mexico and Peru, Von HOLST on the United States, and daily THE SUN. I have mastered Munson shorthand, write it to-day, 100 words per minute (not for business), and can pound a 'Remington'."

"For a period of ten years I have held a position in the Government service—too long, I think, for a young fellow. My salary is \$1,200 a year. I have a good wife, a humble home, but good and nice, and six children, all well formed, healthy, happy, better clothed than their father at the age, yes, better fed."

"Now, have I succeeded or not? Am I where I ought to be for what I did and went through? Mind you, I am sober, always so; do not smoke or chew; but take a drink when I feel I want it—average, three a week."

"THE SUN and myself are old chums. Now, tell me frankly what you think. I am hailed as a good fellow, honest and loyal to my friends, yet there seems to me to be a lacking—that I am fitted for a place I cannot get."

—WASHINGTON, July 31.

Frankly, what do we think? We think and affirm positively and without qualification that our old Washington friend has been successful and enviably successful in his career. He is better off in every way than the great majority of men and he ought to be happy. His letter suggests that he has a disposition which of itself is worth more than material riches, for his query does not imply discontent with his position. He would like to do better. Of course he would. So would everybody else. That is a craving in mankind which prevents the stagnation of society.

The theory that in a future life in heaven will come complete content and perfect satisfaction for the souls of the saved, implies a future which would be

destructive of progress for the individual and reduce him to surfeited and discontented idleness.

In nature there is no rest. Everything is at work, and a man content to remain idle yet satisfied with his condition would be a monstrous exception from the law of being. There is no such man. The most restless and the most discontented of creatures are the people who are rich enough to be idle and who try to make a playtime of life and get satisfaction in loafing. Next come the unfortunate people who search in vain for something to do.

At this time millions of citizens of this republic are waiting impatiently and anxiously for the result of the election next November; yet, however it goes, the personal interests of a very small part of them will be affected in any way. Probably even our Washington friend, though he holds a place in the Government service, will be protected from harm by the civil service law, whether Mr. ROOSEVELT or Judge PARKER shall be elected. Why, then, is anybody concerned about the result? "For a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth," "the life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment." His highest hopes and ambitions and greatest interests are, after all, not purely selfish. Patriotism is described by certain cynical philosophers as folly; and partisanship, in Mugwump estimation, is a sentiment confined to narrow minds. If that is so, the impulse of affection which induces our friend to provide his wife and children with comforts and luxuries which were denied to him in his youth is also silly altruism. He might live in a niggardly fashion and save more money. He might crush out his paternal affection as a too costly luxury. But then he would be poor indeed. Now he is rich; and it is sentiment which enriches him. He has won the greatest of the prizes of life in his happy and loving home. Without it he would be poor and pitiable with millions of money.

Our friend's reading has been good. He could not have made a better selection if he had had ROCKEFELLER's fortune to enable him to buy books by the thousand. One of the great blessings of this time is the cheap price at which the best literature of all ages is obtainable. For the cost of our fare up and down town a man can now buy one of the greatest books which the world has ever produced.

Happy! Everybody is happy and successful who can surround himself with the blessings of a friend's Washington home. He will be happier the more he works and the less he thinks about himself.

Yesterday and To-day.

This is from the observation department of our venerable and always esteemed contemporary the *Utica Observer*, on Aug. 2:

"The man who is to-day most talked of as candidate for Governor on the Democratic ticket is CHARLES W. GOODSTAR of Buffalo."

That may have been true before yesterday. It is not quite true of yesterday or to-day.

The man who is to-day most talked of as candidate for Governor on the Democratic ticket is DANIEL SCOTT LAMONT of Fifty-third street.

Any apprehensions felt by fearsome Populists that THOMAS E. WATSON of Thomson, Ga., would decline or would tarry, waver, equivocate, postpone or hesitate about accepting the Springfield convention's nomination for President have proved groundless. He has accepted in a prepaid telegraph message sent to Chairman PARKER of Kentucky. TIBBLES, the candidate for Vice-President, has also come forward in a receptive turn of mind. Encouraged by these marks of confidence, an ambitious New York Populist submits a project for hiring the Madison Square Garden or some other large hall in this city as a place for the ceremony of nomination.

Such a meeting could be attended by the entire Populist party of the State of New York. What other party in this State could bring every one of its members into one hall at one time? It would enable Candidate WATSON to address more persons than the entire population of Thomson, Ga., and TIBBLES could be for once a big man in the enemy's country, which knows of him rather from his grotesque name than from his statesmanlike achievements.

Moreover, the joint appearance of WATSON and TIBBLES, actual physical and palpable, would put at rest for the balance of the campaign the notion that the Populist party had evaporated or gone on a lecturing tour.

TOM TACONAT is going to make the effort of his life to send one "Indiana" back to his old home in Washington Post.

What deplorable inaccuracy! The Hon. CHARLES WARREN FAIRBANKS, after the worst that THOMAS can do, has a reserved seat on the floor of the United States Senate, and it is his until March 3, 1905.

To choose and classify, to select and accord prominence to campaign books, it is a task which would heavily burden Democratic campaign managers, for great is the abundance of material, the accumulations of Democratic campaign literature from JEFFERSON's time to this. No such difficulty of selection, however, embarrasses the Republicans. Their candidate furnishes them with all the necessary literature in his own works, and popular taste can be gratified.

"The Winning of the West," "American Ideals," and Other Essays, "The Wilderness Hunter," "The Rough Riders" and "The Strenuous Life."

The Red Leopard and the Common Cuck.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: It seems a valuable and very rare animal, to wit, a snow leopard, has been destroyed—shot by a specimen of the common or garden variety of cuckoo. Preposterous! A great commander, afterward a President, on June 12, 1904, in a dilemma about hungry soldiers, famished horses and insubordinate transporters, ordered a forage for the animals instead of rations for the men, on the ground that he couldn't spare the horses, but could get any number of new ones. Another day, not so distinguished in military life, but afterward a President, was said to have said: "I was denied, but there seems to be no doubt about it—that the interest of property must be conserved in the matter of importing contract laborers of the Yellow Peril variety."

There you are. It would be economical to feed a contract laborer on a snow leopard and a few primates and employ young \$800 each in their stead.

—NEW YORK, Aug. 3. DRANE SWITZER.

On the Other Side.

Friend—What is the diagnosis of this patient?—The doctor has told me.

THE LIVE STOCK MEN AT DENVER.

The Special Land Commission appointed by President ROOSEVELT in December last is expected to confer with the representative stockmen of the West, who met yesterday at Denver to discuss the questions of grazing lands, forest reserves and leases of public lands. These are burning questions in the arid regions, and the entire population, from Wyoming to New Mexico, is deeply interested in the meeting.

The commission is composed of W. A. Richards, Commissioner of the General Land Office; Clifford Pinchot, chief of the Bureau of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture; and F. H. Newell, chief hydrographer of the Geological Survey and in charge of the reclamation service. The meeting has been preparing since the year opened. When Messrs. Newell and Pinchot attended the session of the National Live Stock Association at Portland, Ore., in January, they said they were there at the request of the President to collect information that would help them in the discharge of the duties assigned them. The President, in his last annual message, defined these duties as follows:

To report, at the earliest practical moment, upon the condition, operation and effect of the present land laws and on the use, condition and settlement of the public lands; and especially to report what changes in organization, laws, regulations and practice affecting the public lands are needed. To make a study of the present condition of the public lands to actual settlers, who will be permanent homes upon them, and to secure in permanent the fullest and most effective use of the resources of the public lands.

Every one admits that the land laws do not meet the present needs of the arid regions; but there has been a grave difference of opinion between some Government officials and the Western people as to the wisdom of measures that are now in operation to remedy the defect. The commission is expected to base its recommendations upon the knowledge gained by hearing all sides of the questions involved. The forest reserves are a good example of the divergent views that have been held in Washington and on the Western plains and plateaus as to what is best for that part of the country.

Mr. Pinchot told the stock raisers at Portland last winter that the primary object of the forest reserves was the making of homes. The land had been withdrawn from sale in the expectation that in the near future it would be made to produce more water, wood and grass than it does now, and that this improvement would be permanent. The protection of forests and the preservation of water and grass would mean prosperous homes.

But Governor Wells of Utah said, at the same meeting, that the people of his State were astounded when they heard that the Government proposed to withdraw for a forest reserve 5,000,000 acres along the Wasatch Mountains, on whose western base most of the State's development has been made. The people were to be cut off from a large part of the lands suitable for settlement and grazing. The plan was subsequently modified, but 2,500,000 acres have been put into forest reserves, and it is now proposed to withdraw enough more from sale or settlement to include nearly 4,000,000 acres in the reserves. The Governor said that the reserves in Utah are wholly disproportionate in area to the needs they propose to remedy, that reserves should be limited to actual forest lands on watersheds, and that the people would rejoice when at least the non-forest lands now in the reserves were withdrawn from them so that they may be used for homes and grazing.

The press and public men of the other arid States where great reserves of land have been made voice the same complaint. The three forest reserves in Wyoming, for example, embrace 8,564,144 acres. In this vast area no settler is permitted to build a home. No lumberman can cut lumber. No rancher can cut house logs or poles without a permit allowing him to cut some kind of timber. No live stock can graze by permit, and then only in limited numbers. A great many residents of Wyoming say that the progress of the State is impeded by the check which the forest reserves have given to some of their leading industries, and ask that all parts of the reserves not actually timbered be turned back to settlement and use.

Neither side has as yet met this question. Very likely the Bureau of Forestry has pushed its plans with a little too much enthusiasm; and the herders and lumbermen have not fully recognized the good that some measure of forestation may do. The people are especially opposed to the segregation of any land that has water enough for the needs of cultivation, and they say that there is a considerable amount of such land in the reserves. The question needs thorough out.

An issue of still greater economic importance is that of the grazing lands. Mr. Newell says that the area which can ultimately be reclaimed by irrigation is not over 2 to 4 per cent. of the extent of any of the States, and so most of the arid regions must always be devoted to grazing, for which 70 to 80 per cent. is naturally adapted. But the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the live stock that they did ten years ago. The people say these ranges are being destroyed because they are not controlled either by ownership or leasing; and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the grazing lands "should be rented to individuals, in sufficiently large areas, and the ranges have been overstocked; the grasses have been eaten bare or pulled up by the roots, and many ranges do not support one-half the